

other union representatives to dispute her testimony. In her claim, Hansen sought reimbursement from the NAPE union dues that were withheld from her check, from February 1991, when she quit, when she allegedly quit NAPE, until July 1994, when the authorization for payroll deduction was finally stopped. She made several unsuccessful attempts, she claimed, through the Department of Administrative Services, to have her payroll deduction stopped. The committee, after hearing the testimony that she brought before us, considered the United States Supreme Court case ruling involving Pattern Makers v. NLRB, which stated that an individual can quit a union, a labor union at any time, meaning that if she chose to quit, as she alleged, in February or January of 1991, she should have had her dues stopped at that time and she would have been entitled to her dues that approximated \$200 a month to be returned to her, as well as having the union stop taking the money from her paycheck. It was also noted that the Attorney General's Opinion, regarding Hansen's case, which stated that the Department of Administrative Services Personnel Division had no authority to withhold an employee's union dues after the initial authorization is revoked. And this again is based upon the United States Supreme Court case. On the basis of the testimony, the court decision and the AG's Opinion, the committee voted to include Hansen's claim into LB 1391. What the committee was unaware of at the time, and after the vote was taken, and after we'd sent the committee amendment to the entire floor was that there was some dispute as to the facts, that she alleged...that allegedly took place. She'd said that she made unsuccessful attempts to try to get this money stopped, from being pulled from her paycheck. But the other side of the story was that she had become actively involved in the union after she initially chose to withdraw from the union. She became a union steward, and even later was elected to the NAPE Board of Directors. It does not seem consistent with the actions of one who is seeking to quit the organization to become later a union steward as well as a member of the Board of NAPE. It came to our attention that Hansen continued to be active in the union until July of 1985 (sic), when she quit the union again. This time she was successful in having her payroll deduction for dues stopped. To me the actions speak louder than the words that she presented before the committee. It appeared that she took full advantage and participated in the union activities, and during this period that she alleged that she should have had the dues pulled from her paycheck. And it's my belief that in talking to